## STATE OF CALIFORNIA

## BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE

Ü

16.

INQUIRY CONCERNING A JUDGE

No. 69

ANSWER

The undersigned answers the allegations of Count One as follows:

Answering the allegations of paragraph A it is alleged that the Memorandum of Decision was mailed to the parties on October 31,1985.

Answering the allegations of paragraphs C and D the undersigned denies each allegation thereof and further alleges that California Constitution, Article VI. Section 19, and Government Code Section 68210 has no application to the undersigned in that such sections apply only to judges of courts of record: that the justice court is not a court of record as set forth in California Constitution, Article VI, Section 1.

Answering the allegations of paragraph E thereof the undersigned admits the allegations thereof and alleges that such failure to respond was not out of disrespect for the Commission but out of a negative reaction against myself when I received it just after completing the proceedings

in Admonition No. 57, the notice therein being dated September 13.1985.

II

Answereing the allegations of Counts Two and Three, the undersigned incorporates herein his answers to Count One.

III

In rendering its decision I would ask that the Commission consider the fact that while this matter is the latest to come before the Commission, its origin predates prior actions taken.

Further, the common factor in each of the cases which have come before the Commission is the taking of the matters under submission and the submission of briefs. Taking them off of the realendar has led to losing track of the cases. While that is not offered as an excuse of justification, sit is a fact. There is no legitimate excuse for not doing what one is required to do.

It is apparent that I, for whatever reasons peculiar to me and the staffing of this office, cannot take the matter off the courtroom calendar. No longer will I take a matter under submission with the parties to be notified. If a case requires a delay for briefing or other consideration, it will be rescheduled for argument and decision with the decision to be anounced from the bench.

Finally, the Commission is requested, if this answer is permitted to be filed, to accept the appology of the

B

undersigned. Failure to file was the result of the frustration of the undersigned and not for any other reason.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 5,1985, at Explister, California.

Bernard P. McCullough